



**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM
F.Y. 1997 - F.Y. 2000**

RICHLAND COUNTY PLANNING PROGRAM

PREPARED BY: RICHLAND COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MANSFIELD, OHIO JUNE 1996

The Preparation of this Report was Financed in Part Through Planning Grants from the United States Department of Transportation (FHWA & FTA) and the Ohio Department of Transportation.

FINAL

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO

Fiscal Year 1997 - 2000

Richland County Regional Planning Commission

June 14, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY	1
FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND FISCAL CONSTRAINT	2
AIR QUALITY	5
POLICY FOR PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN FTA FUNDED PROJECTS	5
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS	6
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS	7
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS	7
CHANGES IN PRIORITY	7
PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MAJOR PROJECT STATUS	8
APPENDICES	
A. FY 1996 PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS	10
B. FY 1997 - 2000 PROGRAM	15
C. OTHER PROJECTS BEYOND 2000	26
D. TRANSIT PROGRAM FORMS	29

INTRODUCTION

As part of the Urban Transportation Planning Process, under the Federal Planning regulations (Title 23 U.S.C. and Title 49 U.S.C.), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is required to develop and keep current a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in cooperation with State and local officials, the regional or local transit operator and any other affected implementing agency. The MPO in Richland County is the Transportation Coordinating Committee of the Richland County Regional Planning Commission in Richland County.

The TIP is a list of projects that have been identified through the transportation planning program and selected for implementation. Typically, implementation of a highway project involves three major phases or activities, design (PE), right of way acquisition (RW) and construction (C). The projects listed in the TIP are taking or are planned to take one of these major steps towards implementation during the time covered by the TIP. A TIP typically covers 3-5 years, few projects are developed in less than three years and many have taken longer than five years. Therefore, there are projects that have implementation status that will not move into a new phase in the development process during the 4 year period covered by this TIP.

The program lists all project activities and related costs during the program years. The costs must be reasonable within the estimate of financial resources. All projects included on the TIP must be documented as a need through the transportation planning process of the MPO. Projects shown in the first three years of the program may be advanced in a year other than that shown with a letter of concurrence by the MPO.

The first TIP prepared in Richland County as part of the Transportation Planning Process was developed in 1973 as part of the 1990 Transportation Plan. Each year it has been updated and extended. This report describes the methodology used, financial resources available, history of spending and the resulting program for FY 1997-2000 (State fiscal years; July 1, 1996 through June 30, 2000). It also includes listings describing program accomplishment in the last year and other projects with implementation status in Richland County.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY

The approach to the development of the Annual TIP consists of the following steps:

1. A subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is Selected to work with the staff to develop a proposed TIP for the next four (4) years. This subcommittee consists of persons who are familiar with the status of specific transportation projects, and funding capabilities of implementing agencies (the State, the County, Cities and Villages) within the study area.

2. Project phases that have been funded or completed during the previous year are removed from the program and added to a list of program accomplishments for that year.
3. Status of projects is determined and cost estimates are verified or changed on the remaining projects.
4. Where projects can be added, we look to probable Transportation System Management (TSM) activities and the Long Range Plan. In both the TSM process and the Long Range Planning Process, priorities are part of the end product. When the opportunity arises to add a project to the TIP, additional considerations need to be made which include but are not necessarily limited to the following:
 - a) Amount, type and availability limitations of funds
 - b) Relative implementation times
 - c) Local priorities
 - d) Federal and State priorities
 - e) Emergency maintenance needs.
5. Once the draft of the TIP has been developed by the TAC sub-committee it is reviewed by TAC, by the Coordinating Committee and by State and Federal funding agencies. This process begins in November, between November and May (final), the TIP is discussed at the meetings of the transportation committees, which receive good press coverage and at which staff repetitively points out that these are draft materials and that comments are welcomed from members of the committees and the community at large.

Beginning in February 1993, in response to the Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 a special effort to enhance the planning program's public involvement and outreach efforts, public notices and public meetings or open houses were made a part of the TIP development process. In 1994 the Coordinating Committee adopted a formal public involvement process that encompasses not only the TIP process but the entire Transportation Planning Program. The results from it will be documented in the final TIP document.

6. It may become necessary to revise the program during the year. An implementing agency may request a revision, TAC reviews the request and recommends action to the Coordinating Committee and the Coordinating Committee takes the necessary action in the form of a resolution. Projects listed in the first 3 years of the TIP may be advanced by the implementing agency and/or ODOT in a year other than the year specifically mentioned in this document with a letter of concurrence from the MPO.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The purpose of this section is to estimate the financial resources that will be available during the fiscal years covered by this program. The Transportation Improvement Program should then conform to the financial resources that will be set forth in this section.

The Richland County Regional Planning Commission continually tracks available financial resources and the related levels of funding and history of spending and from time to time they publish a Transportation Financial Resources report that summarizes this effort.

As part of the TIP process it is a federal requirement that the program be fiscally balanced and constrained to available resources. There are many sources of funds, some of which are spent at the discretion of the local areas and others that are spent at the discretion of state agencies. There are specific sources of funds, Surface Transportation Program, Minimum Allocation and Donor State, that are allocated to and spent at the discretion of the MPO.

The following page summarizes the status of Surface Transportation Program (STP), Donor State Bonus and Minimum Allocation (MA) funds allocated and available to Richland County for federal fiscal years 1995 through 2000 (October, 1994 through September 30, 2000). Projects are listed as we believe they will be developed and ready for obligations.

In the last couple of TIPs we were able to demonstrate that our overall program was reasonably balanced but it was out of balance by year within the TIP window because all of the projects planned during the 4 years were going to be ready in the first couple of years. Shortfalls were proposed to be managed either through making arrangements to use unobligated funds from other MPO's or the State to implement these projects as shown, or some projects would have to be delayed until funding was assembled. Any additional Federal funding provided by the State would be considered an advance of future MPO funding allocations.

As the result of reduced state apportionments of both STP and MA and an adjustment to MPO allocations to reflect the 1990 census figures, our estimated resources for FY 96 and beyond are even less than we had anticipated.

Now we are in the position where all of the projects will be ready in the next year to 18 months. Estimated allocations of STP and MA are considerably less than what had anticipated. We still propose to handle the shortfalls the same way, but it is going to be difficult if not impossible to show reasonable overall balance within the present TIP window. There are no other STP projects presently being developed in the region and we understand that it will be at least the year 2002 before we can expect to fund another STP project under the present conditions.

RICHLAND COUNTY - MANSFIELD

STATUS STP/DONOR STATE & MA FUNDS. FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS (FFY) 1995-1999

03/29/95

DATE	ALLOCATIONS		BALANCES			BORROW *		STP+MA AVAILABLE FOR USE		EXPENDITURES								
	STP	MA	STP	MA	TOTAL	STP	MA	OBLIGATION LIMIT (STP)	TOTAL WITH MA +BORROW -LOAN	LOAN **		PROJECTS			PID	DESCRIPTION	PE	RWC
										STP	MA	STP	MA	TOTAL				
FFY 94			\$383	\$799	\$1,182													
10/01/94	\$678	\$180	\$1,061	\$979	\$2,040			\$615	\$1,584									
FFY 95			\$770	\$979	\$1,749			\$324	\$1,303									
FFY 95			\$456	\$979	\$1,435			\$10	\$989			\$291	\$0	\$291	13201	LEX-ONT. RD.		X
FFY 95			\$456	\$879	\$1,135			\$10	\$689			\$314	\$0	\$314	10013	SHELBY AVE.		X
FFY 95			\$428	\$679	\$1,107	\$18		(\$0)	\$879			\$0	\$300	\$300	4121	COOK RD.		X
FFY 95			\$428	\$637	\$1,065			(\$0)	\$637			\$28	\$0	\$28	9647	TRIMBLE 2		X
FFY 95			(\$110)	(\$0)	(\$110)	\$538		(\$0)	(\$0)			\$0	\$42	\$42	8562	TRIMBLE 3		X
FFY 95			(\$110)	(\$0)	(\$110)			(\$0)	(\$0)			\$538	\$637	\$1,176	8562	TRIMBLE 3		X
FFY 95			(\$110)	(\$0)	(\$110)			(\$0)	(\$0)									
10/01/95	\$689	\$34	\$579	\$34	\$613			\$750	\$784									
FFY 96			\$567	\$34	\$600			\$738	\$772									
FFY 96			(\$178)	\$34	(\$145)	\$7		\$0	\$34			\$12	\$0	\$12	9647	TRIMBLE 2		X
FFY 96			(\$3,556)	\$14	(\$3,543)	\$3,378		\$0	\$14			\$745	\$0	\$745	9647	TRIMBLE 2		X
FFY 96			(\$3,634)	\$14	(\$3,621)	\$78		\$0	\$14			\$3,378	\$20	\$3,398	4121	COOK RD.	X	X
FFY 96			(\$4,415)	\$14	(\$4,402)	\$781		\$0	\$14			\$78	\$0	\$78	4187	CBD SIGNALS		X
FFY 96			(\$4,415)	\$14	(\$4,402)	\$781		\$0	\$14			\$781	\$0	\$781	4133	STEAM CORNERS		X
FFY 96			(\$4,415)	(\$0)	(\$4,416)			\$0	\$0			\$0	\$14	\$14	7283	SR 309/ROCK RD.		X
FFY 96			(\$4,415)	(\$0)	(\$4,416)			\$0	\$0									
10/01/96	\$792	\$30	(\$3,623)	\$30	(\$3,594)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)	\$34		\$0	(\$0)									
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)			\$826	\$30	\$856	15221	W. 4TH ST.		X
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)									
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)									
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)									
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)									
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)									
10/01/97	\$792	\$30	(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$0	(\$0)	\$792	\$30							
10/01/98	\$792	\$30	(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$0	(\$0)	\$792	\$30							
10/01/99	\$792	\$30	(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822									
FFY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$0	(\$0)	792	30							
TOTALS	\$4,535	\$334				\$4,834	\$0			\$2,376	\$90	\$6,991	\$1,043	\$8,034				

* BORROW - AVAILABLE FUNDS BORROWED FROM ANOTHER MPO OR ADVANCED BY ODOT FOR THESE PROJECTS. TO BE REPAYED WITH FUTURE ALLOCATIONS.

** LOAN - AVAILABLE FUNDS RETURNED ON LOANS AND/OR ADVANCES. OR LOANED TO OTHER MPO'S FOR FUTURE REPAYMENT.

AIR QUALITY

The Richland County Area is considered attainment under the Clean Air Act for ozone and carbon monoxide (CO). As such we are not subject to the requirements under ISTEA for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program. However we feel that our planning program and improvement program lends itself to minimizing increases in emissions and maintaining the attainment status. Furthermore the program lends itself to being expanded and redirected towards efforts related to mitigation should Richland County become non attainment.

POLICY FOR PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN FTA FUNDED PROJECTS

1. Policy and Process Description - The planning of public transportation services in Richland County is the responsibility of the Richland County Regional Planning Commission. Implementation of these services is the responsibility of the Richland County Transit Board. This policy concerns the involvement of the private sector in both planning and implementation of public transportation service. Therefore, this policy has been adopted by both agencies. The transportation plan identifies what public transportation service is to be provided. The development of this plan is reviewed with the Technical Advisory Committee and both, the Local taxi company, and the Richland County Transit Board, have membership on that Committee.

This private sector involvement policy states that the public transportation service, as identified in the Transportation Plan, will be provided by whatever method requires the least public subsidy. Furthermore, any interested private company will be given the opportunity to submit a proposal to provide this service. The subsidy required for the alternative of public operation will be compared with that required for private company proposals.

This solicitation of proposals and evaluation of alternatives will be conducted at five year intervals for the current public transportation service.

Planning for the Specialized Transportation Program, (to purchase vehicles for non-profit agencies to transport elderly and handicapped), is done by a separate committee. This committee includes representation from the local taxi operator and the Richland County Transit Board. This committee will also follow the general policy stated above.

2. List of New and Restructured Services - None

3. Analysis of Existing Public Service - All existing public transportation service is provided through

contracts with private companies. The bus service is provided through a contract with ATE. The current contract expires February 28, 1999. At that time a new solicitation of proposals and evaluation of alternatives will be conducted.

The subsidized taxi service in Shelby is provided through a contract with Mansfield Service Taxi. The original contract was implemented in October 1983 and has been renewed annually since that time.

4. Description of Private Proposals - None in addition to those described above.

5. Description of Private Sector Capital Investment Strategies - None

6. RCTB Private Enterprise Dispute Process - In the event that any party file a protest with the RCTB regarding the procurement of any services, goods or equipment the following action will be taken. The fiscal officer will conduct an analysis of the procurement procedures utilized and the issues raised in the protest. These will be compared to the procurement and private enterprise policy. The fiscal officer will present the protest, the analysis and his recommendation at the next RCTB meeting. The RCTB will review this information and decide whether to deny or accept the protest. This decision will be made and the protester notified in writing within no more than 30 days from the receipt of the protest. If the protest is accepted by the RCTB the procurement in question will be revised; if the protest is denied no change will be made in the procurement.

The RCRPC verifies, as part of the annual TIP report, that this private sector participation process has been followed.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

In October 1994 the Transportation Coordinating Committee of the Richland County Regional Planning Commission adopted a public involvement process for the Transportation Planning Program. The process described in that document for the development of Transportation Improvement Programs was followed.

Preparation of the draft TIP began in November 1995 by staff and a sub committee of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Mansfield Area Transportation Study which is conducted by the Richland County Regional Planning Commission (RPC). A draft list of projects was submitted and approved for submission as a draft by the TAC and the Policy Body (Coordinating Committee of the Mansfield Area Transportation Study) at their February meetings. These meetings receive press coverage and it was stressed that the draft TIP was being

submitted, was available for review, that comments were being accepted and that a formal solicitation of public review and comment would be conducted prior to the adoption of a final document.

On March 18 and 25, 1996 legal notices were published in the Mansfield News Journal announcing the availability of the final draft document and inviting questions and comment on the proposed TIP through April 16, 1996. No copies of the document were requested and no questions or comments were recieved.

Copies of the final draft were distributed to all ODOT districts and all MPO's in preparation for the state TIP (STIP) public involvement process. In turn this agency recieved a copy of the STIP and all MPO TIPS which were available for review and comment through the STIP review period through May 22, 1996. Again no copies of the document were requested and no questions or comments were recieved from the general public.

Finally because there are a number of long awaited and rather exciting projects either under construction or about to go under construction in the community, we are using available STP resources through approximately 2002 to finance these projects, people are excited about what we will do next. Staff felt that this was an excellent oportunity to spend some extra time with the community explaining the actual status of the transportation program.

Special presentations on the status of the transportation program in Richland County were made to both the TAC and Coordinating committees in March and April. The presentation focused on:

1. The significant accomplishments made in the last 2 or 3 years.
2. All of the other projects we would like to see implemented.
3. Status of the State and Federal transportation funding programs.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

Many years ago the MPO recognized and adopted the philosophy that priority should be given to preservation over new construction in the use of available resources. That philosophy is also embraced by both ISTEA and ODOT's long range planning effort (Access Ohio).

There are projects that can be categorized as new construction in the Long Range Plan for Richland County, but the basis of those projects is related to building connecting links and relieving congestion on existing facilities.

More than 90% of the FY 1997-2000 TIP is considered system preservation.

REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS

The following projects, which are presently in some stage of implementation, can be considered regionally significant in that they have not only evolved as part of the MPO planning program but also as part of the State's (Access Ohio) or other parts of the state transportation planning programs.

1. RIC 30 15.208, .33 mi. West of Trimble Rd. to 0.20 Mi. E. of US 42., Widen, reconstruct and upgrade. This section of US 30 is over 40 years old, it carries 30,000 ADT per year, has a higher than average incidence of accidents, interchanges are of substandard design and it involves major structures in need of rehabilitation. Never the less it fails to be a priority project on the state's major capital improvements list through the year 2000.

2. CRA/RIC 30 15.949, Construction of a New 4-lane limited access facility coming into Richland County from the West, one of the few links that need to be constructed to make US 30 a 4-lane limited access facility across the state. This project is presently under PE, construction again will be beyond the year 2000. It is now proposed that the project be split into three phases, the first two of which would go to construction in FY 1999 and 2000, the phase in Richland County would be the last and beyond 2000.

CHANGES IN PRIORITY

The local priorities reflected in this TIP are consistent with priorities of previous TIPS. There have been some changes in State priorities related to fiscal limitations.

PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MAJOR PROJECT STATUS

For the most part the program in Richland County is progressing well. Projects seem to be staying on schedule much better than they had in the past. There are a number of very significant projects that have gone to construction in the last couple of years or that will go to construction in the the first two years of this TIP.

I-71 and SR 39, new interchange	- FY 95
Trimble Rd. 1, widen and reconstruct	- FY 95
Construction of the Richland County Bikeway	- FY 95
Shelby Ave., reconstruction	- FY 95
Trimble Rd. 2, widen and reconstruct	- FY 96
Trimble Rd. 3, widen and reconstruct	- FY 96
City of Mansfield Signal Project	- FY 96
Cook Rd. Extension, new facility	- FY 96
Steam Corners Rd., widen and reconstruct	- FY 96
W. 4th St., resurfacing	- FY 97

The bridge replacement, rehabilitation and reconstruction program in Richland County seems to be progressing well. There

has consistently been about 30 projects on the program and 5-10 projects per year delivered. There were 5 delivered in 1996.

There are several major projects that have been identified in both the local planning program and ODOT's project identification process that have not progressed well. These are projects for which the State of Ohio is the implementing and primary funding agency. These projects have been on and off the program for a number of years and with the State's most recent proposed STIP they seem to be off again.

RIC US 42 04.34, PDMS - 4301, Lexington to Mansfield

This project has been in design phase for a number of years, but is not scheduled for construction in this TIP.

RIC US 42 12.80, PDMS - 9086, Grace St. to Crider Rd.

This project was originally identified in ODOT's Hazard elimination program as a high accident area a number of years ago, more recently it has been reinforced through ODOT's needs study related to Access Ohio. It is not scheduled for construction in this TIP.

RIC SR 97 06.01, PDMS - 6090, I-71 Interchange Area

This project was also identified in ODOT's hazard elimination program as a high accident area a number of years ago. It is scheduled for construction in this TIP, but do to the fact that the area has recently been annexed into the Village of Bellville, it now appears to be Bellville's responsibility to advance or implement the project.

RIC US 30 09.45, PDMS - 12405, Trimble to US 42

This is one of the original segments of US 30 constructed as a 4 lane limited access facility, it carries close to 30,000 cars per day and interchange geometrics are substandard. The project is perceived as widening from 4-6 lanes and upgrade of interchanges. It now appears that it will have no status during the period covered by this TIP.

APPENDIX A
FY 1996 PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PREPARED BY THE RICHLAND COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

FISCAL YEARS 1997-2000

06/14/96 15:00:00

FUNDING SOURCE LEGEND

NOTES ON PROGRAM

FEDERAL

- BR = BRIDGE PROGRAM
- BWM = BIKEWAY FUNDS, URBAN
- BWS = BIKEWAY FUNDS, RURAL
- FTA = TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
- HES = SAFETY PROGRAM
- IM = INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE
- NH = NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
- RRP = RAILROAD PROTECTION
- RRS = RAILROAD SAFETY
- STC = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, COUNTY ALLOCATION
- STM = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, URBAN ALLOCATION
- SYS = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, STATE ALLOCATION
- CMA = CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AIR QUALITY
- HPR = HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH
- PL = PLANNING

STATE

STATE = OHIO

LOCAL

- LEXIN = VILLAGE OF LEXINGTON
- MANSEF = CITY OF MANSEFIELD
- ONTAR = VILLAGE OF ONTARIO
- COUNT = RICHLAND COUNTY
- SHELBY = CITY OF SHELBY

1. FY 96 SHOWN FOR INFORMATION ONLY, FUNDING OBLIGATED OR INCUMBERED BEFORE THE END OF FY 96.
2. FE OR RW COSTS FUNDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY AT 100% ARE NOT ALWAYS KNOWN AND SHOWN.
3. * IN COSTS INDICATES THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE ARE PLANNED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. THE EXACT SCOPE AND COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED. THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY IS USUALLY THE STATE, THE FUNDS INVOLVED ARE ALLOCATED TO THE STATE AND ARE TO BE USED WITHIN THE STATE. PRIORITIES ARE THEREFORE ESTABLISHED ON A STATE WIDE BASIS.
4. FY 2001 FOR INFO ONLY, OBLIGATIONS THAT WILL OCCUR AFTER 2000, FOR PROJECTS WHICH ARE BEING DEVELOPED AND FOR WHICH OBLIGATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR FE OR RW.
5. YEARS HAVE BEEN DETERMINED CONSIDERING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STATUS (ODOT'S MILESTONE REPORT), LOCAL PRIORITIES, AND YEARLY FUNDING CAPACITY.

LEGEND FOR PHASE OF WORK

- C = CONSTRUCTION FOR HIGHWAY, CONSTRUCTION OR CAPITAL ACQUISITION FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
- O = TRANSIT OPERATIONS.
- P = FE FOR HIGHWAY, PLANNING FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
- R = RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION.

APPENDIX B
FY 1997 - 2000 PROGRAM

FINAL

RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PREPARED BY THE RICHLAND COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

FISCAL YEARS 1997-2000

06/14/96 15:00:00

FUNDING SOURCE LEGEND

FEDERAL

BR = BRIDGE PROGRAM
BWM = BIWAY FUNDS, URBAN
BWS = BIWAY FUNDS, RURAL
FTA = TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
HES = SAFETY PROGRAM
IH = INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE
NH = NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
RRP = RAILROAD PROTECTION
RPS = RAILROAD SAFETY
STC = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, COUNTY ALLOCATION
STM = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, URBAN ALLOCATION
STS = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, STATE ALLOCATION
CMA = CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AIR QUALITY
HFR = HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH
PL = PLANNING

STATE

STATE = OHIO

LOCAL

LEXIN = VILLAGE OF LEXINGTON
MANSF = CITY OF MANSFIELD
ONTAR = VILLAGE OF ONTARIO
COURT = RICHLAND COUNTY
SHELE = CITY OF SHELBY

NOTES ON PROGRAM

1. FY 96 SHOWN FOR INFORMATION ONLY, FUNDING OBLIGATED OR INCUMBERED BEFORE THE END OF FY 96.
2. FE OR RW COSTS FUNDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY AT 100% ARE NOT ALWAYS KNOWN AND SHOWN.
3. * IH COSTS INDICATES THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE ARE PLANNED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. THE EXACT SCOPE AND COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED. THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY IS USUALLY THE STATE, THE FUNDS INVOLVED ARE ALLOCATED TO THE STATE AND ARE TO BE USED WITHIN THE STATE. PRIORITIES ARE THEREFORE ESTABLISHED ON A STATE WIDE BASIS.
4. FY 2001 FOR INFO ONLY, OBLIGATIONS THAT WILL OCCUR AFTER 2000, FOR PROJECTS WHICH ARE BEING DEVELOPED AND FOR WHICH OBLIGATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR FE OR RW.
5. YEARS HAVE BEEN DETERMINED CONSIDERING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STATUS (ODOT'S MILESTONE REPORT), LOCAL PRIORITIES, AND YEARLY FUNDING CAPACITY.

LEGEND FOR PHASE OF WORK

- C = CONSTRUCTION FOR HIGHWAY, CONSTRUCTION OR CAPITAL ACQUISITION FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
O = TRANSIT OPERATIONS.
P = FE FOR HIGHWAY, PLANNING FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
R = RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION.

RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

C O U N T Y	R O U T E	S E C T I O N (M)	L E N G T H (M)	L O C A T I O N A N D T E R M I N I L	T O T A L C O S T \$1000	T Y P E F E D B A C K	P A S S E D F W O R K	S H A R E O F C O S T S (\$1,000)					F I S C A L Y E A R	S T A T E R E C O R D S	A D D I T I O N S	R E S T R I C T I O N S	O T H E R R E C O R D S	M I S C E L L A N E O U S	C H A N G E I N D E X	R E S A P G O E N N S C I Y B L E		
								1996	1997	1998	1999	2000									2001	
								****	****	****	****	****									****	
RIC SR097 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	33.152 12015 360		0.032	0.23 MI. N OF ASHLAND CO. LINE REPLACE 13' BRIDGE	98	OH OH STS	P C C	15			17 66									1	A	STATE
RIC TR145 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	NONE 281		0.080	WERNER RD., 150 FT N OF LOST R UN RD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	171	BR FIC RIC	C P C			36		110 25								1		COUNT
RIC TR169 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	NONE 280		0.080	STEIN RD., 0.10 M E OF STIVIN G RD. BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	218	BR RIC RIC	C P C			38		144 36								1		COUNT
RIC CR191 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	NONE 277		0.097	PLY. SPR. RD, 0.10 M S OF SR 9 6 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	306	BR RIC RIC	C P C			46		208 52								1		COUNT
RIC CR201 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	NONE 279		0.113	MYERS RD., 0.30 M E OF SR 314 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	228	BR FIC RIC	C P C			38		192 48								1		COUNT
RIC CR215 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	15214 269		0.016	BOWMAN ST., 0.2 MI N OF MILLER RD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	568	BR FIC RIC	C P C	80	393 95											1		COUNT
RIC CR233 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	NONE 278		0.064	AMOY GAUGES RD., 0.10 M S OF L INN RD. BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	171	BR FIC RIC	C P C			36		108 27								1		COUNT

RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

C O U N T Y	R O U T E	S E C T I O N (EM)	L E N G T H (MI)	L O C A T I O N A N D T E R M I N E	T O T A L C O S T (\$1000)	T Y P E P E R I O D P W O R K I N G	P H A S E O F W O R K	SHARE OF COSTS (\$1,000)					S A D D L A H E / R E C O R D	A D D I T I O N A L R E C O R D	H E W E L L C O H E S T R U C T	R E S T A B L E I N D U S T R Y	M I S C E L L A N E O U S	C H A N G E I N D U S T R Y	R E S A P G O E N N S C I Y B L E
								FISCAL YEAR											
								**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000							
RIC SR545 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	009.930 15778 292			RESURFACING	286	OH	C		286								X	STATE	
RIC SR546 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	002.623 NONE 291			2 LANE RESURFACING	638	OH	C		638								X	STATE	
RIC SR603 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	013.080 12274 293			RESURFACING	52	OH	C		52								X	STATE	
RIC SR603 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	11.813 13365 266	0.097		0.16 MI S OF SR 96 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	466	BE OH OH OH	C F P C	100		285 3 78								1 A	STATE
RIC ALL SYSTEMS PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	ALL SYSTEMS NONE 990			RAIL HIGHWAY CROSSING SAFETY	*	OH OH STS STS	F C P C		*	*	*	*	X						STATE
RIC ALL SYSTEMS PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	ALL SYSTEMS NONE 991			HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH	*	HER OH PL STS	P P P P		*	*	*	*							
RIC ALL SYSTEMS PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	ALL SYSTEMS NONE 992			PPE. OF IND. PROGRAM DOC. AND PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO LPAS	*	OH STS	P P		*	*									

RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

C O U N T Y	P O U L T E	S E C T I O N (EM)	L E N G T H (EM)	L O C A T I O N A N D T E R M I N E	T O T A L C O S T \$1000	T Y P E O F E X P E N D I T U R E	P H A S E O F W O R K D E	S H A R E O F C O S T S (\$1,000)					C A F E T Y U P G R A D E	A D D I T I O N A L C O S T	R E S T R I C T I O N S	O T H E R I D E N T I F I C A T I O N S	M I S C E L L A N E O U S	C H A N G E I N D E X	R E S P O N S I B I L I T Y	
								F I S C A L Y E A R												
								**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000								**** 2001 ****
RIC	ALL SYSTEMS			NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROJECTS	*	OH	C		*											STATE
	PROJ. (PDMS)	NONE																		STATE
	LOCAL NUMBER	999A																		
RIC	ALL SYSTEMS			PUBLIC SAFETY 402 SAFETY PROGRAM	*	OH	C		*					X						STATE
	PROJ. (PDMS)	NONE																		STATE
	LOCAL NUMBER	999B																		
RIC	COUNTY WIDE		HA	TRANSIT PLANNING, CAPITAL & OPERATIONS	1278	FTA	C		404											COUNT
	PROJ. (PDMS)	NONE				FTA	P		132											
	LOCAL NUMBER	999E				FTA	C		150											
						MAR	C		148											
						MAR	P		10											
						OH	C		143											
						OH	P		17											
						OH	C		26											
						OH	P		1											
						RIC	C		73											
						RIC	P		5											
						SHE	C		1											
						SHE	P		1											

APPENDIX C

OTHER PROJECTS WITH IMPLEMENTATION STATUS
BEYOND 2000

FINAL

RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PREPARED BY THE RICHLAND COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

FISCAL YEARS 1997-2000

06/14/96 15:09:00

FUNDING SOURCE LEGEND

FEDERAL

BR = BRIDGE PROGRAM
BUM = BIKEWAY FUNDS, URBAN
BWS = BIKEWAY FUNDS, RURAL
FTA = TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
HES = SAFETY PROGRAM
IM = INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE
NH = NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
RRP = RAILROAD PROTECTION
RRS = RAILROAD SAFETY
STC = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, COUNTY ALLOCATION
STM = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, URBAN ALLOCATION
STS = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, STATE ALLOCATION
CMA = CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AIR QUALITY
HPR = HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH
PL = PLANNING

STATE

STATE = OHIO

LOCAL

LEXIN = VILLAGE OF LEXINGTON
MANSF = CITY OF MANSFIELD
ONTAR = VILLAGE OF ONTARIO
COUNT = RICHLAND COUNTY
SHELB = CITY OF SHELBY

NOTES ON PROGRAM

1. FY 96 SHOWN FOR INFORMATION ONLY, FUNDING OBLIGATED OR INCURRED BEFORE THE END OF FY 96.
2. PE OR RW COSTS FUNDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY AT 100% ARE NOT ALWAYS KNOWN AND SHOWN.
3. * IN COSTS INDICATES THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE ARE PLANNED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. THE EXACT SCOPE AND COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED. THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY IS USUALLY THE STATE, THE FUNDS INVOLVED ARE ALLOCATED TO THE STATE AND ARE TO BE USED WITHIN THE STATE. PRIORITIES ARE THEREFORE ESTABLISHED ON A STATE WIDE BASIS.
4. FY 2001 FOR INFO ONLY, OBLIGATIONS THAT WILL OCCUR AFTER 2000, FOR PROJECTS WHICH ARE BEING DEVELOPED AND FOR WHICH OBLIGATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR PE OR RW.
5. YEARS HAVE BEEN DETERMINED CONSIDERING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STATUS (ODOT'S MILESTONE REPORT), LOCAL PRIORITIES, AND YEARLY FUNDING CAPACITY.

LEGEND FOR PHASE OF WORK

- C = CONSTRUCTION FOR HIGHWAY, CONSTRUCTION OR CAPITAL ACQUISITION FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
O = TRANSIT OPERATIONS.
P = PE FOR HIGHWAY, PLANNING FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
R = RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION.

RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

C O U N T Y	R O U T E	S E C T I O N (EM)	L E N G T H (EM)	L O C A T I O N A N D T E R M I N I	T O T A L C O S T \$1000	T Y P E F E D E R A L F U N D I N G	P H A S E O F W O R K I N G	S H A R E O F C O S T S (\$1,000)					S A F E T Y U E R E C O R D	A D D I T I O N A L R E C O N S T R U C T I O N	N E W C O N S T R U C T I O N	R E C O N S T R U C T I O N	O T H E R B U I L D I N G S	M I S C E L L A N E O U S	C H A N G E I N D E X	R E S A P G E O N N S C Y I B L E	
								F I S C A L Y E A R													
								**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000									**** 2001 ****
RIC US030 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	00.000 10762 249	26.24	4 - LANE NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY FE ONLY, NEW FACILITY	1630	BH OHI	P P	1304 326							X						STATE	
RIC US030 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	15.208 12405 239	7.596	.33 MI. W OF TRIM. TO .20 MI E OF US 42 PE ONLY, MAJOR REHAB & RECON.	2086	BH OHI	P P								X		0			A	STATE	
RIC US042 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	06.985 4301 28	5.359	LEXINGTON TO MANSFIELD WIDEN & RECONSTRUCTION	6970	MAN BH BH OHI OHI OHI	P P R C P C	4 1107 880 3780 220 945							X		1			A	STATE	
RIC US042 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	18.588 12013 257	0.241	.17 MI. N OF SR 430, SUBWAY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	2696	BR OHI OHI OHI	R C P R C								X		1			A	STATE	
RIC US042 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	22.563 9086 232A	1.657	US 30 TO .11 MI N OF CRIDER RD HES, WIDEN & RECONSTRUCT	1594	HES HES HES OHI OHI OHI	P P P P P C	115 231 319 13 26 91							X		0				STATE	
RIC SR097 PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	09.672 6090 137	1.014	SR 97 & I 71 HES, WIDEN & RECONSTRUCT	718	OHI OHI STS STS	P C P C	6 51										0	X	A	STATE	
																					595

APPENDIX D
TRANSIT PROGRAM FORMS

**OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
TRANSIT**

SUMMARY SHEET

F. Y. (begin July 1)	Total Expenditures				Federal Funding		
	Capital *	Operating	Planning		Capital *	Operating	Planning
1997	158,000	953,900	168,000		150,000	403,000	134,000
1998	138,000	983,000	173,000		130,000	418,000	138,000
1999	38,000	1,012,000	178,000		30,000	433,000	142,000
2000	38,000	1,042,000	183,000		30,000	413,000	146,000

*Includes all 5310 (Specialized Transportation) funds.

** The use of Richland County's FTA Section 9 annual allocation to funds this program is illustrated on the attached table.

OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TRANSIT

ANTICIPATED SECTION 5307 PLANNING SCHEDULE

(Thousands of Dollars)

F. Y.	Recipient of funds	Agency Responsible for Project Implementation	Total Project Cost	Fed. Fund. Section 9	State Fund. ODOT	Local Fund. Other	Sect.9 Allocation
1997	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	168	134	16	18	34 from FY97 100 Deobligated RCT Terminal
1998	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	173	138	16	19	99 from FY97 39 from FY98
1999	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	178	142	16	20	94 from FY98 48 from FY99
2000	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	183	146	16	21	84 from FY99 62 from FY2000

OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TRANSIT

ANTICIPATED OPERATING SCHEDULE

(Thousands of Dollars)

F. Y.	Recipient of funds	Agency Responsible for Project Implementation	Oper. Expend.	Oper. Revenues	Net Project Cost	Subsidy Local Other	State	Federal	Sect.9 Allocation
1997	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	954	147	807	261	143	403	106 from FY95 297 from FY96
1998	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	983	147	836	275	143	418	29 from FY95 297 from FY97 46 from FY98 46 deobligated from '95 Grant
1999	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	1,012	147	865	289	143	433	251 from FY98 182 from FY99
2000	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	1,042	147	895	339	143	413	116 from FY99 297 from FY2000

OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TRANSIT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Federal Fund	Recipient of funds	Agency Responsible for Project Implementation	Total Project Cost	Source of Federal Funding	Amount of Federal Funding	Amnt of State Funding	Amnt Local Funding	Planning Document.
Sec. 9	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board						
Sp. Tr.	Agency to be determined	Agency to be determined				ODOT	Other	
F. Y.	Description							
1997	One Wheelchair Acc. Replacement Vehicle		38	Sp. Tr. Program	30		8	95 TSM
1997	Three Used Service Autos for RCT Bus Parts & Garage Equipment for RCT		120	Sect. 9 *	120			95 TSM
1998	One Wheelchair Acc. Replacement Vehicle		38	Sp. Tr. Program	30		8	95 TSM
1998	One Para-Transit Replacement Busses RCT Service Truck		100	Sect. 9 *	100		0	95 TSM
1999	One Wheelchair Acc. Replacement Vehicle		38	Sp. Tr. Program	30		8	95 TSM
2000	One Wheelchair Acc. Replacement Vehicle		38	Sp. Tr. Program	30		8	95 TSM

* Subject to ODOT approval the Governors apportionment of Section 9 funds and Toll Revenue Credit (TRC) will be used to fund these projects. If TRC is not available the RCTB will provide local matching or the project will be delayed.

TABLE 1 -USE OF RICHLAND COUNTY FEDERAL SECTION 9 ALOCATION-- 1995-2000

FISCAL YEAR	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	Deobltn*	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Allocation		\$473,873	\$508,260	\$524,472	\$429,874	\$146,000	\$429,874	\$429,874	\$429,874	\$429,874	
Operating Limit		\$194,310	\$403,253	\$396,140	\$297,105	\$46,000	\$297,105	\$297,105	\$297,105	\$297,105	
Spent											
95 Operating	\$141,184		\$282,816								\$424,000
95 Planning	\$25,521		\$92,816								\$118,337
95 Cap Misc.			\$59,000								\$59,000
95 Cap Terminal			\$73,565	\$193,666	\$132,769						\$400,000
96 Operating		\$194,310		\$195,190							\$389,500
96 Planning		\$130,400									\$130,400
96 Capital		\$106,080		\$0	\$0						\$106,080
97 Operating				\$106,395	\$297,105						\$403,500
97 Planning						\$100,000	\$34,000				\$134,000
98 Operating				\$29,221		\$46,000	\$297,105	\$45,674			\$418,000
98 Planning							\$98,769	\$39,231			\$138,000
99 Operating								\$251,431	\$181,569		\$433,000
99 Planning							\$0	\$93,538	\$48,462		\$142,000
2000 Operating									\$115,536	\$297,105	\$412,641
2000 Planning								\$0	\$84,307	\$61,693	\$146,000
Total Spent	\$166,705	\$430,790	\$508,197	\$524,472	\$429,874	\$146,000	\$429,874	\$429,874	\$429,874	\$358,798	\$3,854,458
Balance											
Oper.		\$0	\$120,437	\$65,334	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$43,083	\$63	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$71,076	

*Funds will be deobligated 1995 Grant, \$100,000 from Terminal Project & \$46,000 from Operating.